



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/715,421

11/19/2003

Sung-Kyung Jang

P-0592

5333

34610

7590

07/07/2009

KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, VA 20153-1200

EXAMINER

PHUONG, DAI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/07/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/715,421	Applicant(s) JANG, SUNG-KYUNG	
	Examiner DAI A. PHUONG	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9, 11,13-19,21, 23-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 13-19 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Argument

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 03/31/2009, with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

2. The amendment filed 03/31/2009 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: wherein the re-transmission data includes data that was previously partially sent to a transport channel.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 3-11 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 8 and 11 recite “**the re-transmission data includes data that was previously partially sent to a transport channel**” (see amendment filed 03/26/2008). This is matter not found in the specification as filed; therefore, it lacks support in the original disclosure. Claims 3-7, 9-10, 13-18 rejected for the same reasons. See MPEP 706.03(o).

Applicant did not provide a concise explanation of where support for the newly added limitations can be found referring to the specification as originally filed by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 8, 11, 16-19 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rinne et al. (Pub. No. 20050207388).

Regarding claim 1, Rinne et al. disclose a radio data transmission method comprising:

receiving information from a plurality of logical channels, each received information including information about an amount of re-transmission data that exists in a buffer that corresponding to the specific logic channel ([0044], [0047] and [0060]); and

selecting data to transmit from one of the plurality of logical channels based at least on the received information about the amount of the re-transmission data that exists in a buffer for each specific logic channel and based on whether re-transmission data exist in the corresponding buffer of a logical channel rather than by a priority of the logical channel, wherein the re-transmission data includes data that was previously partially sent to a transport channel ([0044], [0047] and [0060]).

Regarding claim 8, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claim 11, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claim 16, Rinne et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 11. Further, Rinne et al. disclose the method further comprising prioritizing a first logical channel having re-transmission data in a corresponding buffer with a higher priority than a second logical channel without re-transmission data in a corresponding buffer, and transmitting data of the first logical channel prior to transmitting data of the second logical channel ([0044], [0047] and [0060]).

Regarding claim 17, Rinne et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 11. Further, Rinne et al. disclose the method wherein the selecting of data of the specific logical channel is performed based on priorities of corresponding logical channels when a plurality of logical channels include re-transmission data in a corresponding buffer ([0044], [0047] and [0060]).

Regarding claim 18, Rinne et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 11. Further, Rinne et al. disclose the method wherein the selection of the specific logical channel is performed based on priorities of each logical channel when logical channels do not include re-transmission data in a corresponding buffer ([0044], [0047] and [0060]).

Regarding claim 19, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claim 22, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claim 23, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claim 24, Rinne et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 23. Further, Rinne et al. disclose the device wherein the data characteristic represent whether the re-transmission data exists for the selected logical channel in its corresponding buffer ([0009]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinne et al. (Pub. No. 20050207388) in view of Shima (U.S. 6333789).

Regarding claim 3, Rinne et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 1. However, Rinne et al. do not disclose the method wherein the information about the amount of the re-transmission data comprises one of a True indication representing that the re-transmission data exists in the buffer corresponding to the specific logic channel and a False indication representing that the re-transmission data does not exist in the buffer corresponding to the specific logic channel.

In an analogous art, Shima discloses the method wherein the information about the amount of the re-transmission data comprises one of a True indication representing that the re-transmission data exists in the buffer corresponding to the specific logic channel and a False indication representing that the re-transmission data does not exist in the buffer corresponding to the specific logic channel (col. 1, line 48 to col. 2, line 48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mobile telecommunication system of Rinne et al. by specifically including the information about the amount of the re-transmission data comprises one of a True indication representing that the re-transmission data exists in the buffer corresponding to the specific logic channel and a False indication representing that the re-transmission data does not exist in the buffer corresponding to the specific logic channel, as taught by Shima, the motivation being in order to transmit data in a timing interval.

Regarding claim 9, this claim is rejected for the same reason as in claim 3.

In an analogous art, Shima discloses the method wherein selecting data is based on whether data exist rather than by a priority of the logical channel (col. 1, line 48 to col. 2, line 48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mobile telecommunication system of Rinne et al. by specifically including selecting data is based on whether data exist rather than by a priority of the logical channel, as taught by Shima, the motivation being in order to to transmit data in a timing interval.

9. Claims 4 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinne et al. (Pub. No. 20050207388) in view of Jiang (Pub. No.: 20040085932).

Regarding claim 4, Rinne et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 4. However, Rinne et al. do not disclose the method sending the information from each of the logical channels to a transport channel.

In the same field of endeavor, Jiang discloses sending the information from each of the logical channels to a transport channel ([0005]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mobile telecommunication system of Rinne et al. by specifically including sending the information from each of the logical channels to a transport channel, as taught by Jiang, the motivation being in order to provide for optimized TFC selection on transport channel.

Regarding claim 21, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 4.

10. Claims 5-7 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinne et al. (Pub. No. 20050207388) in view of Charriere et al. (U.S. 6944178).

Regarding claim 5, Rinne et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 4. However, Rinne et al. do not disclose the method wherein sending the information comprises sending a MAC_STATUS_RESP Primitive (fig. 4, col. 3, line 31 to col. 5, line 62).

In the same field of endeavor, Charriere et al. disclose the method wherein sending the information comprises sending a MAC_STATUS_RESP Primitive (fig. 4, col. 3, line 31 to col. 5, line 62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mobile telecommunication system of Rinne et al. by specifically including disclose the method wherein sending the information comprises sending a MAC_STATUS_RESP Primitive, as taught by Charriere et al., the motivation being in order to provide a set of information channels in the RLC layer for connection to the buffer and a set of transport channels in the MAC layer for transmission of the data units.

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Rinne et al. and Charriere et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 5. Further, Charriere et al. disclose the MAC_STATUS_RESP Primitive includes information of the amount of the re-transmission data (fig. 4, col. 3, line 31 to col. 5, line 62).

Regarding claims 7, the combination of Rinne et al. and Charriere et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 5. Further, Charriere et al. disclose the MAC_STATUS_RESP Primitive includes information of the amount of the re-transmission data (fig. 4, col. 3, line 31 to col. 5, line 62).

Regarding claim 13, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 5.

Regarding claim 14, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 6.

Regarding claim 15, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 7.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dai A Phuong whose telephone number is 571-272-7896. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Dai A Phuong/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617
Date: 07/01/2009

/Patrick N. Edouard/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617